

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 22-34, 36-46 were pending prior to this amendment. Claims 24, 29, and 42 were indicated as having allowable subject matter. Claims 1-18, 22, 23, 25-28, 30-34, 36-41 and 43-46 stand rejected and claims 24, 29, and 42 are objected to. Claims 1, 3, 5, 24-27, 33, 34 and 37 are amended. Claims 22, 23, 29, 38-46 have been cancelled. New claims 47-56 have been added. At least in light of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 24, 29, and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicant acknowledges the allowable subject matter identified in claims 24, 29, and 42. The rejection is moot for claim 24 because claim 24 is no longer a dependent claim. The objection is moot for claim 29 because the features of claim 29 have been moved into the independent claim 27. The objection is moot for claim 42 because claims 38-46 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18, 22, 23, 25-28, 30-34, 36-41, and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0037040 (Beadles). Claims 1-18, 24, 25-28, 30-34, 36, 37 and 47-56 are currently pending. Applicant submits that claims 1-18, 24, 25-28, 30-34, 36, 37 and 47-56 are allowable over Beadles. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections for the reasons explained herein.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant claims a computer operable to: display a document including editable text corresponding to a configuration file for a network device, receive a user input modifying a selected portion of the text, and exchange communications with the network device to dynamically modify the configuration file stored on the network device and for *generating incremental configuration changes in a network device*. These features avoid certain disadvantages of prior configuration tools. *See* the present specification page 2, lines 25-27.

The device disclosed in Beadles displays various lists of predetermined policies from which lists the users select their desired network policies. *See* Beadles, 0047, 0048 and 0062. Additionally, the device disclosed in Beadles appears to limit a user to effecting configuration

changes en masse. *See* FIG. 10 showing the sentence, “Click FINISH to create the new policy.” Effecting configuration changes en masse is not generating incremental configuration changes in the network device. In contrast, Applicant’s disclosed device allows a user to dynamically modify the configuration file stored on the network device and generate incremental configuration changes in the network device, as is disclosed in Claim 1. Claims 2-18 are dependent on claim 1 and should also be allowed.

Claim 24 is amended and has been rewritten in independent form. Applicant submits that claim 24 should be allowed for the reasons it was deemed allowable in the Office Action if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Although, Applicant amended claim 24 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicant regards as the invention, it is believed that the amendments did not remove limitations deemed to be allowable in the Office Action. Thus, claim 24 should be allowed. Claims 25 and 26 are dependent on claim 24 and should also be allowed.

With regard to claims 28 and 30-32, as noted above, claim 29 has been rewritten in allowable independent form in currently amended claim 27. Claims 28 and 30-32 depend from claim 27 thus claims 28, 30-32 should be allowed.

Claim 33 is amended to include allowable features from amended claim 27 and should be allowed for this reason. Claims 34, 36 and 37 depend from claim 33 and should also be allowed.

Claims 38-46 have been cancelled.

The remarks above are believed to address all rejected claims; however, any claims not specifically addressed in the remarks above are allowable for at least similar reasons as explained with claim 1 or at least similar reasons as the subject matter indicated as allowable.

New claims

New claim 47 should be allowed. Beadles teaches network device configuration changes made through an intermediary such as a policy software wizard or the base configuration creator. *See* Beadles, FIG. 10 and 0089. In contrast, Applicant’s disclosed

device exchanges communications directly with the network device to dynamically modify the configuration file stored on the network device, as is disclosed in Claim 47. Applicant submits that claim 47 distinguishes from Beadles on at least the foregoing basis. Thus, claim 47 should be allowed.

New claims 48-50 should be allowed. These claims include similar features as claim 24, which was indicated as having allowable subject matter, and thus should be allowed for at least similar reasons.

New claim 51 has been added. New claim 51 includes features similar to claim 29, which was indicated as having allowable subject matter, and thus should be allowed for at least similar reasons.


New claims 52-56 are dependent on claim 51 and should also be allowed for at least the same reason as claim 51. Additionally, these claims include similar features as claim 24, which was indicated as having allowable subject matter, and thus should be allowed for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 503-224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP



Michael A. Cofield
Reg. No. 54,630

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
503-224-2170
Customer No. 73552